

Publishing Patterns of Highly Cited Scholars in Tourism and Hospitality

C. Michael Hall

Department of Management, Marketing and Entrepreneurship
University of Canterbury, New Zealand

Abstract

There is ongoing interest in tourism and hospitality with respect to the citation performance of individual scholars. This is, at least in part, a response to the growth of national and institutional research assessment exercises. However, the publication profiles of highly ranked scholars is often little discussed. This paper uses Google Scholar as a citation analysis tool and identifies a range of different publishing profiles that exist. Although journals are the dominant publication medium books and book chapters are also significant, while disciplinary differences are also identified.

Keywords: Ranking, Google Scholar, Research Assessments, Citation Analysis, Tourism, Hospitality

Introduction

Google Scholar™(GS) is one of the most significant citation tools available to researchers. GS was first released as a beta project by Google in 2004 and has since become utilized because its is free and easy use and therefore provides ready access to literature that may otherwise be unavailable (Hall, 2006; Murphy & Law, 2008). As well as citations of individual articles, GS also provides publicly available citation counts for individual scholars who choose to use this service and for serials and periodicals. Therefore, GS has now become widely used by researchers as a means of assessing the impact of research (Aguillo, 2011; Amara & Landry, 2012; Bontis & Serenko, 2009; Chapron & Husté, 2006; Harzing & van der Wal, 2009; Moussa & Touzani, 2010; Rosenstreich & Wooliscroft, 2009).

GS has been used in tourism and hospitality studies, alongside other bibliographic databases such as the Web of Science (WoS) and Scopus, as a means of identifying scholarly influence and relationships (e.g., Benckendorff & Zehrer, 2013; Law, Ye, Chen & Leung, 2008; Law & van der Veen, 2008; McKercher, 2008). There is also a growing body of literature to suggest that GS metrics -like other sources of academic citations, rankings and impact-are being used as a *de facto* indicator in assessments of research quality (Chan, Chang & Chang, 2013; Mingers, 2009; Soutar & Murphy, 2009; Soutar, Wilkinson & Young, 2015), despite the substantial debate that exist around their appropriateness (e.g. Adler & Harzing, 2009; Bollen, Rodriguez & Van de Sompel, 2006; Bollen, Van de Sompel, Hagberg & Chute, 2009; Calver, 2013; Hall 2005, 2011, 2013a, 2013b; Hall & Page, 2015; Jacsó, 2012a, 2012b, 2012c; Leydesdorff, 2008; Oppewal, 2015; Özbilgin, 2009; Pendlebury, 2009; Serenko & Dumay, 2015). The present paper examines the publishing profiles of the most cited scholars on GS that self-declare their research interests in tourism, hospitality and cognate subjects up to the end of 2014. The analysis is therefore different from other studies of highly cited tourism scholars (e.g. Benckendorff & Zehrer, 2013; McKercher, 2008) in that the

individuals included in the analysis have self-identified with tourism as a subject, while the range of citation sources include theses and book chapters as well as journal articles and monographs. Before detailing the analysis the paper first discusses GS metrics and the research method.

Google Scholar Metrics

Different bibliographic databases (e.g. Web of Science (WoS), Scopus) and academic search engines, such as GS, have different rules of inclusion and exclusion of documents from which citations indicators are drawn (Leydesdorff, Moya-Anegón & Nooy, 2015). Khabisa and Giles (2014) estimated there were 114 million circulating documents written in English in the academic Web, of which GS had around 99.8 million. Google does not publish the size of the GS database, although Orduña-Malea, Ayllón, Martín-Martín and Delgado López-Cózar (2014) estimated that it contained approximately 160 million documents as of May 2014. In contrast in 2014 WOS had about 57 million records, Microsoft Academic Search slightly less but broadly of a similar size, and Scopus 53 million records (Orduña-Malea et al., 2014).

Nevertheless, there are substantial differences in distribution of document types between the different bibliographic databases. For example, according to Orduña-Malea et al. (2014), the percentages of documents by type, collected in WoS for the period 1900 to 2014, indicates that “Journal document type” (composed by articles, meeting abstracts, editorial material and letters) represents 75% of all documents, Proceedings 21%, and “Book and Book chapters” only 1%. They also note that World Cat (the largest bibliometric information system in the world) provided a figure of 16.3 million “thesis”(i.e. doctoral, masters or degree) documents.

Given that GS includes thesis documents as well as other non-journal and non-proceedings material it proves especially significant for a field such as tourism that otherwise reflects the heterogeneity of the social science literature that “causes intractable problems for bibliometrics. Social science more often than natural science is published in books” (Hicks, 1999, p. 212). Her review suggested that, at the time, “books comprise at least 40% and possibly as much as 60% of the social science literature. Books are very highly cited individually and collectively account for about 40% of citations” (Hicks, 1999, p. 201). GS citations therefore overcome an over emphasis on the ‘Journal article’ format in citation analyses and provides greater recognition for several non-serial yet quality-assured forms of publication such as books and book chapters as well as theses (Kousha, Thelwall & Rezaie, 2011).

As Hicks (2004) suggested, by only focusing on one of the four literatures of the social sciences, that of journal articles (the others being books, national and non-scholarly literature), a “distorted” picture of social science, including tourism and hospitality research, is provided. Furthermore, there is increasing acknowledgment that much, if not the majority of tourism research as measured by research outputs is taking place outside ‘tourism journals’ (Coles, Hall & Duval, 2016; Hall, 2011; Wardle & Buckley, 2014). Indeed, Hicks’ (2004, p. 474) notes that “ironically” that with respect to the use of bibliometrics, “this tool of the Mode II ‘audit culture’ works best on traditional Mode I science areas” and not the social sciences (see Coles, Hall & Duval, 2006, 2016, with respect to the relationships between post-disciplinarity and mode II knowledge in tourism research). This is also of importance because the greatest conceptual impacts or impacts related to practice, policy and knowledge transfer do not always emerge from journal articles (Hall, 2013a). For example, Hicks (1999, p. 197) argues “The additional time taken to produce a book should allow it to become intellectually more substantial and thus raise its impact... producers of social science indicators are forced to admit that the best social science is often found in books”. Nevertheless, there are also differences with respect to the citation characteristics of books,

including with respect to the Thomson Reuters' Book Citation Index. For example, Leydesdorff and Felt (2012) analyzed the citation differences between monographs, edited volumes and book chapters and noted the conceptual limitations that arise when book chapters are considered to be individual contributions and how this may affect subsequent analysis of researcher output; the number of citations that books receive; and the problems that arise from differences between book series and annual series (see also Torres-Salinas et al., 2014).

Method

Since 2012 GS has allowed individual researchers with verifiable emails to create individual public citation profiles. These pages allow the inclusion of up to five research interests, which are also available to search. Profiles are editable by the researchers. This is a significant element of the profiles as, for those researchers that edit their profiles, it allows for the removal of duplicated or wrongly attributed authorship of publications, as well as ensuring the accuracy of citations. Google Scholar also automatically calculates and displays the individual's total citation count both overall and for the previous five years, their *h*-index (the largest number *h* such that *h* publications have at least *h* citations), and their *i10*-index (the number of publications with at least ten citations).

A citation analysis of highly cited researchers (greater than 2,000 citations) was conducted on 31 December 2013 and 2014. It is intended that such an intercept approach will allow the development of a time series of scholar citations. Google Scholar profiles were searched using key words for self-declared research interests in tourism, hospitality, leisure, events and cognate terms. Individuals can nominate up to five such interests. Individuals were not included in the research results if they were clearly not the author of publications listed on the first page of their profile. Three researchers were excluded from the 2014 analysis as a result (Xuan Lorna Wang, Middlesex University; Youcheng Wang, University of Central Florida; Tsung Hung Lee, National Yunlin University of Science & Technology). Jonas Larsen remained included although a large number of citations were derived from earlier editions of a book that he had subsequently served as a co-author with John Urry. This has since here been modified in his GS profile. High cited scholars who publish on tourism subjects and had a GS link such as John Crompton and the late John Urry were not included at the time because they did not indicate any disciplinary association. This has subsequently changed with John Crompton listing tourism and recreation as research fields and John Urry sociology and mobility.

Results

Table 1 lists the 74 tourism and hospitality researchers listed on GS with over 2,000 citations as at 31 December 2014. The table includes various rankings, the number of citations, the *h*-index and the *i*-index. Comparisons are available between 2014 and 2013 for those researchers with public profiles at both intercept periods. In addition, comparisons are drawn with the results of Benckendorff and Zehrer (2013) who listed highly cited first named authors cited in 'top tier' tourism journals, and McKercher (2008, 2014). Almost half (35) of the highly cited scholars on GS were also in these lists.

Table 1: Researchers with over 2,000 Google Scholar citations as of end 2014

Name	No. of citation s (end 2014)	Rank	No. of citati ons sinc e 200 9	Rank	h- inde x 201 4	Rank	h- inde x sinc e 200 9	Rank	i-10 inde x 201 4	i-10 inde x sinc e 200 9	No. of citation s (end 2013)	h- inde x 201 3	Google Scholar categories (end 2014)	Institution	Country	B. & Z. Most cited - 2010	B. & Z. Most cited 2006 - 2010	McK - Most cited 1970 - 2007	McK - Most cited 1998 - 2007	McK - Most cited 2008 - 2014
C. Michael Hall	25 082	1	15 329	1	80	1	65	1	315	265	20 412	69	Tourism; Geography; Sustainability; Business; Global environmental change	University of Canterbury	New Zealand	2	1	3	1	3
Arch Woodside	11 127	2	5 688	7	50	2	36	7=	193	119	9 394	47	advertising business-to-business; tourism; pricing; consumer research	Boston College	USA	8	7	38	-	-
Dimitrios Buhalis	10 975	3	7 348	2	45	7	36	7=	126	90	8 465	38	Etourism; Strategy; Management; Marketing; tourism	Bournemouth University	UK	21	=10	17	2	4
Chris Ryan	10 236	4	5 931	5	48	4=	40	3	146	119	8 468	45	Tourism	University of Waikato	New Zealand	3	3	14	9	17
Muzzo Uysal	10 186	5	6 284	4	48	4=	38	5	107	76	8 595	45	Tourism development and management; Quantitative analysis; Demand-supply interaction; Tourism motivation and satisfaction; Quality-of-life research in tourism	Virginia Tech	USA	-	-	11	26	-
Jonas Larsen	9 543	6	5 349	8	19	63=	17	61=	24	23	8 161	17	Geography; cycling; tourism; photography; mobilities	Roskilde University	Denmark	-	-	-	-	-
Daniel R. Fesenmeyer	9 307	7	5 760	6	47	6	37	6	143	89	7 820	44	Tourism; information technology; marketing; recommendation systems	Temple University	USA	-	-	21	19	22
Allan Williams	9 006	8	4 409	14	49	3	35	12=	140	76			Migration; geography; tourism	University of Surrey	UK	-		19	5	-
Rob Law	8 868	9	7 340	3	44	8=	43	2	141	134	6 470	40	Technology Management; Tourism; Hospitality	Hong Kong Polytechnic University	Hong Kong	-	-	-	14	1
Philip Pearce	8 858	10	4 554	12	42	13=	30	25=	111	86	7 533	39	Tourism; tourist behaviour; visitor evaluation; tourist attractions; tourism and communities	James Cook University	Australia	5	18	7	-	-
Abraham Pizam	8 625	11	4 657	10	42	13=	32	17=	91	72			Hospitality Management; Tourism Management	University of Central Florida	USA	7	8	9	-	-
Geoff Godbey	7 740	12	3 628	24	36	22=	28	29=	65	45	4 803	30	Recreation; Parks; Leisure and tourism; Time use; Health	Pennsylvania State University	USA	-	-	-	-	-
Susan Fainstein	7 459	13	3 262	32	42	13=	28	29=	86	45	6 403	37	Planning theory; Urban redevelopment; Tourism	Harvard University	USA	-	-	-	-	-

Alistair Morrison	7 416	14	4 413	13	44	8=	35	12=	92	80			Tourism; Hospitality; Travel	Purdue University	USA	-	20	7	48
Greg Richards	7 263	15	4 796	9	40	17	33	13=	90	70	5 854	37	Tourism; Leisure; Culture; Events; Creativity	University of Tilburg & NHTV Breda University of Applied Sciences	Neth.	-	57	46	-
Christian Rogerson	6 907	16	3 331	31	41	16	30	26=	200	92	5 263	36	Tourism and Development; Local Economic Development; Small Enterprise Development	University of Johannesburg	South Africa	-	-	-	-
Ralf Buckley	6 555	17	3 357	30	43	12	32	17=	129	82			Ecotourism; tourism; conservation; environment; ecology	Griffith University	Australia	-	-	-	41
Bob McKercher	6 294	18	4 400	15	44	8=	36	7=	90	83			Tourism	Hong Kong Polytechnic University	Hong Kong	-	42	18	36
Mike Crang	6 200	19	3 861	20	36	22=	31	21=	58	54	5 104	32	Cultural geography; tourism studies; urban informatics; visual methods; heritage	Durham University	UK	-	-	-	-
Nigel Morgan	6 044	20	4 060	18	39	18	33	15=	75	70	4 986	35	Tourism; hopeful tourism; place reputation and brands; tourism and citizenship	Cardiff Metropolitan University	UK	-	-	15	-
Francesco Ricci	5 810	21	4 562	11	36	22=	30	26=	104	73	4 265	31	Case based reasoning; personalization; recommender systems; tourism; user modeling	University of Bozen-Bolzano	Italy	-	-	-	-
Daniel Scott	5 809	22	4 340	16	44	8=	36	7=	104	92	4 150	38	Tourism; Climate; Geography	University of Waterloo	Canada	-	-	-	12
David Weaver	5 756	23	3 417	28	34	29=	28	29=	67	49	4 905	32	Sustainable tourism; ecotourism; tourism management	Griffith University	Australia	-	-	26	37
John Bowen	5 722	24	3 520	27	21	59=	19	52=	30	28	4 762	18	Marketing; loyalty; hospitality marketing; services marketing; casino management	University of Houston	USA	-	29	6	-
Larry Dwyer	5 717	25	3 909	19	36	22=	31	21=	93	76			tourism economics; tourism management; tourism planning	University of New South Wales	Australia	-	48	30	30

Annette Pritchard	5 550	26	3 746	23	37	20=	31	21=	68	62	4 542	33	Tourism; hopeful tourism; place reputation and brands; tourism and citizenship	Cardiff Metropolitan University	UK	-	-	51	10	-
Stephen McCool	5 503	27	2 671	36	35	27=	25	35=	83	42			Protected area planning; management of visitors and tourism; public engagement; tourism	University of Montana	USA	-	-	-	-	-
Stefan Gossling	5 457	28	4 274	17	37	20=	36	7=	76	69	4 285	35	Mobility; transport; tourism	Lund University	Sweden	-	-	-	-	5
Dallen Timothy	5 263	29	3 592	25	36	22=	32	17=	86	77			Tourism; borders; heritage; culture; religion	Arizona State University	USA	-	-	56	23	-
Haiyan Song	5 222	30	3 853	21	38	19	35	12=	82	75	3 903	33	Tourism; tourism economics; forecasting	Hong Kong Polytechnic University	Hong Kong	-	-	-	24	9
James F. Petrick	4 553	31	3 540	26	32	32	31	21=	49	47	3 593	30	Tourism; Loyalty; Revisit Intentions; Value; Quality	Texas A&M University	USA	-	-	-	-	42
Bing Pan	4 550	32	3 801	22	23	51=	22	42=	32	28	3 560	22	Tourism, Hospitality	College of Charleston	USA	-	-	-	-	15
Alan Fyall	4 509	33	2874	34	23	51=	20	49=	40	31	3 075	22	Tourism; Destination Marketing and Management	University of Central Florida	USA	-	-	-	-	6
Paul Eagles	4 474	34	2308	43	30	36	23	38=	56	43	3 818	29	Tourism; ecotourism; park management; nature-based tourism; environmental planning	University of Waterloo	Canada	-	-	-	-	-
Caroline Ashley	4 385	35	2 361	42	31	33=	23	38=	53	41			Inclusive business; results; impact; tourism	Ashley Insight	UK	-	-	-	-	-
Richard Perdue	4 231	36	2 115	45	28	39=	20	49=	47	30	3 654	25	Tourism	Virginia Technical University	USA	-	-	25	-	-
Alan Lew	4 150	37	2 197	44	31	33=	23	38=	82	45	3 312	28	Tourism Studies; Urban Planning; Regional Geography of E & SE Asia	Northern Arizona University	USA	-	-	-	-	-
Roy Ballantyne	4 078	38	2 617	37	34	29=	29	28	70	55	3 258	31	Visitor Research; Environmental Interpretation/Education; Visitor Free-choice Learning; Eco- and Wildlife Tourism; Visitor Experiences	University of Queensland	Australia	-	-	-	-	39
Daniel Funk	3 979	39	3 024	33	33	31	32	17=	58	58	2 941	28	Sport Marketing; Tourism; Consumer Behavior; Involvement	Temple University	USA	-	-	-	-	-
Ulrike Greisel	3 893	40	3 369	29	28	39=	26	32=	62	56	2 819	25	Tourism; persuasion; social media; technology adoption; intelligent systems	University of Queensland	Australia	-	-	-	-	8

Cathy Hsu	3 810	41	2 863	35	35	27=	39	4	79	71			Hotel and Tourism Management	Hong Kong Polytechnic	Hong Kong	-	-	-	43
Felix T. Mavondo	3 518	42	2 539	38	29	37=	25	35=	46	38			Strategic Marketing; Dynamic Capabilities; Tourism; Business-to- Business	Monash University	Australia	-	-	-	-
Bruce Prideaux	3 513	43	2515	39	29	37=	26	32=	78	65			Tourism; Rainforest tourism; Climate change; Heritage; Sustainability	James Cook University of North Queensland	Australia	-	-	-	46
Beverley Sparks	3 338	44	2 457	41	31	33=	26	32=	54	48	2 579	28	Tourism; marketing; consumer behaviour	Griffith University	Australia	-	-	-	-
Susanne Becken	3 054	45	2 485	40	24	49=	23	38=	47	40	2 291	21	Tourism	Griffith University	Australia	-	-	-	32
Ross Dowling	3 035	46	1 902	48	25	45=	21	45=	59	39	2 543	23	Tourism; environment; geotourism; ecotourism; cruise ship tourism	Edith Cowan University	Australia	-	-	-	-
Jamie Murphy	2 883	47	1 847	49	28	39=	24	37	60	50	2 382	25	Digital media; Digital marketing; Tourism; Community learning	Australian School of Management	Australia	-	-	-	-
James Higham	2 820	48	1 846	50	28	39=	22	42=	52	43			tourism management; sport and tourism; sustainable tourism	University of Otago	New Zealand	-	-	-	44
Harold Goodwin	2 819	49	1 705	52	25	45=	21	45=	39	31	2 363	23	Tourism; Conservation; Responsible tourism	Manchester Metropolitan University	UK	-	-	-	-
Cevat Tosun	2 752	50	1 912	47	19	63=	18	58=	22	20	2 261	18	Tourism management; Sustainable tourism development; Participatory development approach; community participation in tourism development process; destination marketing	Gazi Universitesi	Turkey	-	-	-	-
Raffaele Paci	2 717	51	1 340	61	26	43=	20	49=	42	32	2 305	22	Regional economics; Innovation; tourism	University of Cagliari	Italy	-	-	-	-
Mark Orams	2 713	52	1 310	62	25	45=	19	52=	38	27	2 402	22	Coastal and Marine Tourism; Ecotourism; Wildlife Tourism	Auckland University of Technology	New Zealand	-	-	-	-
Kreg Lindberg	2 705	53	1 032	67	20	62	15	65=	28	19	2 492	19	Recreation; Tourism; Natural Resources	Oregon State University	USA	-	-	39	-
Brian King	2 664	54	1 519	57	22	57=	19	52=	52	35			Tourism; events; hospitality	Hong Kong Polytechnic	Hong Kong	-	-	-	-
Penny Simpson	2 583	55	1 482	58	19	63=	15	65=	20	18			Marketing; tourism; market orientation	University of Texas-Pan American	USA	-	-	-	-
Xavier Font	2 476	56	1 600	54	26	43=	21	45=	55	39	2 057	22	Responsible Tourism Marketing	Leeds Beckett University	UK	-	-	-	-
Donald Hawkins	2 370	57	814	68	23	51=	15	65=	45	22			Tourism; environment; international development; conservation; protected areas	George Washington University	USA	-	-	-	-
Brian Garrod	2 366	58	1 584	55	23	51=	19	52=	35	31	2 057	22	Tourism visitor	Aberystwyth University	UK	-	-	-	-

Susan Moore	2 355	59	1 558	56	23	51=	19	52=	43	30	2 285	22	Environmental science; Tourism; Environmental policy	Murdoch University	Australia	-	-	-	-	-
AtillaYuksel	2 335	60	1 743	51	23	51=	21	45=	29	26			Marketing; destination management; sustainable tourism; hospitality; research	Adnan Menderes University	Turkey	-	-	-	-	-
	2 283	61	1 451	59	24	49=	18	58=	38	27			Tourism	Essec Business School	France	-	-	-	-	-
YoelMansfeld	2 266	62	1 189	66	19	63=	15	65=	38	26			Tourism	University of Haifa	Israel	-	-	-	-	-
David Simmons	2 262	63	1 218	64	19	63=	16	63=	44	20			Tourism; planning; impact assessment	Lincoln University	New Zealand	-	-	-	-	-
David Marcoullier	2 213	64	1 216	65	21	59=	16	63=	33	24			Tourism economics; forest economics; rural development	University of Wisconsin - Madison	USA	-	-	-	-	-
Jin-Li Hu	2 189	65	1 925	46	22	57=	19	52=	40	36			Chinese Economy; Banking and Finance; Tourism Economics; Energy Policy; Efficiency	National Chiao Tung University	Taiwan	-	-	-	-	-
Brent W. Ritchie	2 116	66	1 671	53	25	45=	22	42=	44	39			Tourism	University of Queensland	Australia	-	-	-	-	-
David Newsome	2 018	67	1 434	60	21	59=	18	58=	36	32			Tourism; Ecotourism; Wildlife; Geotourism; Geomorphology	Murdoch University	Australia	-	-	-	-	25
Peter M. Burns	2 014	68	1 277	63	19	63=	17	61=	35	29			Tourism; climate change; community development; poverty reduction strategies	University of Bedfordshire	UK	-	-	-	-	-

Almost a third of researchers are affiliated to institutions in the United States (30.9%), followed by Australia (22.1%) and the United Kingdom (14.7%). Given their size the contribution of New Zealand and Hong Kong based researchers (both 7.4%) is also notable. These results are similar to those of Benckendorff and Zehrer (2013) who examined highly cited first authors in three academic journals.

In terms of gender 11.8% of the most cited researchers on GS were female. This compares to 12% of the 25 most cited researchers identified by Benckendorff and Zehrer (2013) and 10% of the 50 most cited identified by McKercher (2008) for 1998-2007 and McKercher (2014) for 2008-2014. These figures are also similar to those identified by Munar et al. (2015). Table 2 provides a further breakdown of gender by number of citations for the tourism, hospitality and leisure research categories. It shows that the overall proportion of females in the 500 most cited tourism researchers is 34.6% as compared to 26.4% overall for hospitality (n=72) and 44.2% for leisure (n=43). These differences also potentially reflect the extent to which different academic sub-cultures may be more welcoming to women (Hall, 2013b), although this is clearly a topic that needs to be explored further.

Table 2: Gender representation by rank order band for Google Scholar citations in tourism, hospitality and leisure

Subject	Male	Female
Tourism		
1-50	86%	14%
1-100	85%	15%
101-200	66%	34%
201-300	58%	42%
301-400	60%	40%
401-500	58%	42%
1-500	65.4%	34.6%
Hospitality		
1-50	84%	16%
1-72	73.6%	26.4%
Leisure		
1-43	55.8%	44.2%

Note: Analysis conducted on Google Scholar 31 December 2014

Table 3 provides an analysis of the most cited authors in terms of their identified research interests. Of the 74 scholars should read 49 are associated with tourism. The next largest categories are ecotourism and marketing with six indications of interest and hospitality and tourism management with five. Table 3 also indicates the remarkable diversity of associated approaches and interests that authors have in tourism research.

Table 3: Most-cited authors self-identified research interests

Number of researchers stating research interest	Research interest
49	Tourism
6	Ecotourism, Marketing
5	Hospitality, Tourism Management
4	Geography, Tourism Economics
3	Conservation, Environment, Heritage, Sustainable tourism
2	Climate Change, Consumer Behaviour, Culture, Events, Geotourism, Hopeful tourism, Loyalty, Place reputation and brands, Recommendation systems, Recreation, Sustainability, Tourism and citizenship, Tourism Studies
1	Advertising business-to-business, Banking and Finance, Borders, Business, Business-to-Business, Case based reasoning, Casino management, Chinese Economy, Climate, Coastal and Marine Tourism, Community development, Community learning, Community participation in tourism development process, Consumer research, Creativity, Cruise ship tourism, Cultural geography, Cycling, Demand-supply interaction, Destination management, Destination marketing, Destination Marketing and Management, Digital marketing, Digital media, Dynamic Capabilities, Eco- and Wildlife Tourism, Ecology, Efficiency, Energy Policy, Environmental Interpretation / Education, Environmental Planning, Environmental policy, Environmental science, Etourism, Forecasting, Forest economics, Geomorphology, Global environmental change, Health, Hospitality Management, Hospitality marketing, Hotel and Tourism Management, Impact, Impact assessment, Inclusive business, Information technology, Innovation, Intelligent systems, International development, Involvement, Leisure, Leisure and tourism, Local Economic Development, Management, Management of visitors and tourism, Market orientation, Mobilities, Mobility, Natural Resources, Nature-based tourism, Park management, Parks, Participatory development approach, Personalization, Persuasion, Photography, Planning, Planning theory, Poverty reduction strategies, Pricing, Protected area planning, Protected areas, Public engagement, Quality, Quality-of-life research in tourism, Quantitative analysis, Rainforest tourism, Regional economics, Regional Geography of E & SE Asia, Religion, Research, Responsible tourism, Responsible Tourism Marketing, Results, Revisit Intentions, Rural development, Services marketing, Small Enterprise Development, Social media, Sport and tourism, Sport Marketing, Strategic Marketing, Strategy, Sustainable tourism development, Technology adoption, Technology Management, Time use, Tourism and communities, Tourism and Development, Tourism development and management, Tourism motivation and satisfaction, Tourism planning, Tourism visitor, Tourist attractions, Tourist behaviour, Transport, Travel, Urban informatics, Urban Planning, Urban redevelopment, User modelling, Value, Visitor evaluation, Visitor Experiences, Visitor Free-choice Learning, Visitor Research, Visual methods, Wildlife, Wildlife Tourism

Although, as noted above, different bibliometric databases focus on different publications, there is little assessment of the publication profiles of different authors (Hunt, Gao & Xue, 2014; Lee, Law & Ladkin, 2014). Table 4 provides a breakdown of the type of publications that highly cited authors produce via an analysis of their 20 highest cited publications as well as the number of journal articles that have received over 100 citations on Google Scholar, therefore giving a fully appreciation of publishing strategies.

On average just under three-quarters of the top 20 cited publications as of the end of 2014 are journal articles, followed by books (17.6%) and book chapters (9.9%). Meaning that of the top 20 publications for a most cited author almost four are books or major reports and almost two are book chapters. In terms of the total number of publications produced, books are therefore disproportionately highly cited. The significance of books and, to a lesser extent, book chapters also reflects Hicks' (1999) comments on the importance of focussing on all of the literatures of the social sciences in assessments of tourism citations and publishing, rather than excluding book chapters and books. Including them, for example, highlights the contribution of researchers such as Caroline Ashley, much of whom's work is more applied and in well cited reports, and Susan Feinstein who is a notable book editor and author. Nevertheless, the table clearly illustrates the range in different publishing strategies.

Also of interest is the extent to which highly cited authors are single or multiple authors and the extent to which they are named as first authors. Eleven of the 50 most cited authors have no single authored publications in their 20 highest cited. In contrast, 75% of Ralf Buckley's highest cited publications are single authored. On average only just over 20% of the most cited papers are sole authors. Of those that are co-authored the most cited scholar is first named author slightly less than half of the time. Although there is substantial variation with the relationship to author order not necessarily appearing linked to the alphabet order of the surname. However, given the range of different disciplinary and institutional traditions with respect to author order that exist (Osborne & Holland, 2009), it is not necessarily possible to empirically attribute contribution just from author order.

Table 4: Publication profile of 50 most cited tourism researchers on Google Scholar

Name	No. of citations (end 2014)	Rank	No. of citations 2009-2014	Rank	h-index end 2014	Journal articles >100 citations	Journal articles (in the 20 highest cited publications)	%	Books / Book length reports	%	Book chapters / conference proceedings / Short reports (in the 20 highest cited publications)	%	Single authored (in the 20 highest cited publications)	%	Co-authored (in the 20 highest cited publications)	%	First-named author (in co-authored publications)	%
C. Michael Hall	25 082	1	15 329	1	80	16	3	15%	16	80%	1	5%	9	45%	11	55%	6/11	54.5%
Arch Woodside	11 127	2	5 688	7	50	15	17	85%	2	10%	1	5%	2	10%	18	90%	13/18	72.2%
Dimitrios Buhalis	10 975	3	7 348	2	45	11	14	70%	3	15%	3	15%	4	20%	16	80%	10/16	62.5%
Chris Ryan	10 236	4	5 931	5	48	20	15	75%	5	25%	0	-	8	40%	12	60%	7/12	58.3%
Muzzo Uysal	10 186	5	6 284	4	48	27	19	95%	0	-	1	5%	0	-	20	100%	6/20	30.0%
Jonas Larsen	9 543	6	5 349	8	19	5	11	55%	4	20%	5	25%	7	35%	13	65%	6/13	46.2%
Daniel R. Fesenmaier	9 307	7	5 760	6	47	21	20	100%	0	-	0	-	0	-	20	100%	1/20	5.0%
Allan Williams	9 006	8	4 409	14	49	8	9	45%	9	45%	2	10%	1	5%	19	95%	7/19	36.8%
Rob Law	8 868	9	7340	3	44	23	20	100%	0	-	0	-	1	5%	18	90%	5/18	27.8%
Philip Pearce	8 858	10	4 554	12	42	14	14	70%	6	30%	0	-	9	45%	11	55%	5/11	45.5%
Abraham Pizam	8 625	11	4 657	10	42	20	18	90%	2	10%	0	-	2	10%	18	90%	12/18	66.7%
Geoff Godbey	7 740	12	3 628	24	36	9	15	75%	5	25%	0	-	4	20%	16	80%	2/16	11.1%
Susan Fainstein	7 459	13	3 262	32	42	5	5	20%	14	70%	1	5%	5	25%	15	75%	10/15	66.7%
Alistair Morrison	7 416	14	4 413	13	44	17	17	85%	3	15%	0	-	2	10%	18	90%	1/18	5.6%
Greg Richards	7 263	15	4 796	9	40	3	8	40%	10	50%	2	10%	7	35%	13	65%	10/13	76.9%
Christian Rogerson	6 907	16	3 331	31	41	3	15	75%	4	20%	1	5%	13	65%	7	35%	2/7	28.6%
Rail Buckley	6 555	17	3 357	30	43	8	15	70%	4	20%	1	5%	15	75%	5	25%	2/5	40.0%
Bob McKercher	6 294	18	4 400	15	44	14	18	90%	2	10%	0	-	4	20%	16	80%	9/16	56.3%
Mike Crang	6 200	19	3 861	20	36	9	10	50%	6	30%	4	20%	11	55%	9	45%	5/9	55.6%
Nigel Morgan	6 044	20	4 060	18	39	7	12	60%	5	25%	3	15%	0	-	20	100%	9/20	45.0%

Francesco Ricci	5 810	21	4 562	11	36	8	10	50%	1	5%	9	45%	2	10%	18	90%	6/18	33.3%
Daniel Scott	5 809	22	4 340	16	44	13	17	85%	2	10%	1	5%	2	10%	18	90%	13/18	72.2%
David Weaver	5 756	23	3 417	28	34	9	15	75%	4	20%	1	5%	14	70%	6	30%	5/6	83.3%
John Bowen	5 722	24	3 520	27	21	5	16	80%	4	20%	0	-	0	-	20	100%	10/20	50.0%
Larry Dwyer	5 717	25	3 909	19	36	11	19	95%	1	5%	0	-	0	-	20	100%	19/20	95.0%
Annette Pritchard	5 550	26	3 746	23	37	6	10	50%	5	25%	5	25%	0	-	20	100%	9/20	45.0%
Stephen McCool	5 503	27	2 671	36	35	10	16	80%	4	20%	0	-	2	10%	18	90%	7/18	38.9%
Stefan Gossling	5 457	28	4 274	17	37	13	15	75%	5	25%	0	-	7	35%	13	65%	10/13	76.9%
Dallen Timothy	5 263	29	3 592	25	36	10	12	60%	7	35%	1	5%	8	40%	12	60%	6/12	50.0%
Haiyan Song	5 222	30	3 853	21	38	11	18	90%	2	10%	0	-	0	-	20	100%	9/20	45.0%
James F. Petrick	4 553	31	3 540	26	32	10	20	100%	0	-	0	-	8	40%	12	60%	15/12	41.7%
Bing Pan	4 550	32	3 801	22	23	9	16	80%	0	-	4	20%	0	-	20	100%	8/20	40.0%
Alan Fvall	4 509	33	2874	34	23	3	12	60%	5	25%	3	15%	1	5%	19	95%	7/19	38.9%
Paul Eagles	4 474	34	2308	43	30	7	13	65%	6	30%	1	5%	5	25%	15	75%	5/15	33.3%
Caroline Ashley	4 385	35	2 361	42	31	1	4	20%	1	5%	15	75%	3	15%	17	85%	13/17	76.5%
Richard Perdue	4 231	36	2 115	45	28	11	19	95%	1	5%	0	-	4	20%	16	80%	6/16	37.5%
Alan Lew	4 150	37	2 197	44	31	3	8	40%	6	30%	6	30%	5	25%	15	75%	4/15	26.7%
Roy Ballantyne	4 078	38	2 617	37	34	13	18	90%	2	10%	0	-	0	-	20	100%	16/20	80.0%
Daniel Funk	3 979	39	3 024	33	33	9	17	85%	2	10%	1	5%	1	5%	19	95%	14/19	73.7%
Ulrike Gretzel	3 893	40	3 369	29	28	5	15	75%	0	-	5	25%	1	5%	19	95%	7/19	36.8%
Cathy Hsu	3 810	41	2 863	35	35	6	20	100%	0	-	0	-	1	5%	19	95%	5/19	26.3%
Felix T. Mavondo	3 518	42	2 539	38	29	8	20	100%	0	-	0	-	0	-	20	100%	5/20	25.0%
Bruce Prideaux	3 513	43	2515	39	29	7	18	90%	0	-	2	10%	7	35%	13	65%	4/11	30.8%
Beverley Sparks	3 338	44	2 457	41	31	6	19	95%	1	5%	0	-	1	5%	19	95%	5/19	26.3%
Susanne Becken	3 054	45	2 485	40	24	8	18	90%	2	10%	0	-	8	40%	12	60%	18/12	66.7%
Ross Dowling	3 035	46	1 902	48	25	0	5	25%	8	40%	7	35%	5	25%	15	75%	3/15	20.0%
Jamie Murphy	2 883	47	1 847	49	28	4	18	90%	0	-	2	10%	0	-	20	100%	6/20	30.0%
James Higham	2 820	48	1 846	50	28	5	14	70%	6	30%	0	-	4	20%	16	80%	8/16	50.0%
Harold Goodwin	2 819	49	1 705	52	25	5	10	50%	1	5%	9	45%	8	40%	12	60%	4/12	33.3%
Cevat Tosun	2 752	50	1 912	47	19	8	18	90%	0	-	2	10%	9	45%	11	55%	7/11	63.6%
Average	6277		3918			9.58	14.50	72.3%	3.52	17.6%	1.98	9.9%	4.2	21%	15.8	79%		46.6%

Conclusions

This paper has sought to provide a profile of highly cited scholars in tourism and hospitality and cognate studies using GS research profiles, in contrast to previous studies that may have utilised either WoS, Scopus or only a limited use of GS that excludes book chapters (McKercher, 2008; Zopiatis, Theocharous & Constanti, 2015). In terms of utilising as wide a universe of academic publication as possible, that include the four literatures of the social sciences (Hicks, 2004) as well as Mode I and Mode II knowledge, GS would appear to offer considerable advantages over WoS and Scopus, including cost. However, there are also disadvantages with respect to GS research profiles as they do require editing and clean up to improve accuracy, especially in the case of chapters of edited books where both the editor(s) and the author(s) are often listed as authors. In addition, concerns have been expressed over the coverage and quality of GS, especially with respect to the inclusion of 'grey' academic and institutional material (which ironically may also demonstrate wider societal impact) and potential vulnerability to spam and manipulation of citation results (Beel & Gipp, 2009). Nevertheless, these criticisms are balanced by GS's comprehensiveness and improvements in coverage and metrics, while, as with all Web-based search engines, and even citation analysis in bibliographic databases-the linked content and/or data should not be trusted blindly (Beel & Gipp, 2010). GS researcher profiles appear to be a potential new tool to assist in assessing the research impact of individuals in tourism and hospitality as well as academic networks. Doing so may not only provide indicative performance measures and insights into the development of academic knowledge, but should also help such processes become more transparent.

The publishing strategies of highly cited scholars appear highly varied with respect to the mix of journal and non-journal publications. There is some potential evidence that those scholars with North American and/or marketing and business school type backgrounds place far more emphasis on journal articles than those from geography, sociology and the broader social sciences, who tend to emphasise books and book chapters more. However, this is a qualitative assessment as the current sample size remains relatively limited. Subsequent assessments of the growing citation base of scholar may provide new insights into publishing patterns as well as other related issues such as gender representation, the dominance of English as the lingua franca of international academic studies in tourism and hospitality, and the broader international representation of scholars in academic publishing.

Acknowledgments

The comments of Robin Nunkoo and Yael Ram on an earlier version of the paper are gratefully acknowledged. The usual caveats apply.

References

- Adler, N. J., & Harzing, A. W. (2009). When knowledge wins: Transcending the sense and nonsense of academic rankings. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 8(1), 72-95.
- Aguillo, I.F. (2011). Is Google Scholar useful for bibliometrics? A webometric analysis. *Scientometrics*, 91, 343-351.
- Amara, N., & Landry, R. (2012). Counting citations in the field of business and management: why use Google Scholar rather than the Web of Science. *Scientometrics*, 93, 553-581.
- Benckendorff, P., & Zehrer, A. (2013). A network analysis of tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 43, 121-149.
- Beel, J., & Gipp, B. (2009). Google scholar's ranking algorithm: an introductory overview. In B. Larsen & J. Leta (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Scientometrics and Informetrics (ISSI'09)*, Vol. 1 (pp. 230-241). Rio de Janeiro:

International Society for Scientometrics and Informetrics.

Beel, J., & Gipp, B. (2010). Academic search engine spam and google scholar's resilience against it. *Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 13(3). DOI:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0013.305>

Bollen, J., Rodriguez, M. A., & Van de Sompel, H. (2006). Journal status. *Scientometrics*, 69(3), 669-687.

Bollen, J., Van de Sompel, H., Hagberg, A., & Chute, R. (2009). A principal component analysis of 39 scientific impact measures. *PloS one*, 4(6), e6022.

Bontis, N., & Serenko, A. (2009). A follow-up ranking of academic journals. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 13(1), 16-26.

Calver, M. C. (2013). RAM the PI-BETA, C3PO – what the H-STAR happened to my promotion application? Or: The pros and cons of bibliometric evaluations of researchers. In D. Lunney, P. Hutchins & H. Recher (Eds.) *Grumpy Scientists: The ecological conscience of a nation* (pp. 106-121). Mosman, NSW: Royal Zoological Society of New South Wales.

Chan, K. C., Chang, C. H., & Chang, Y. (2013). Ranking of finance journals: Some Google Scholar citation perspectives. *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 21, 241-250.

Chapron, G., & Husté, A. (2006). Open, fair, and free journal ranking for researchers. *Bioscience*, 56(7), 558-559.

Coles, T.E., Hall, C.M., & Duval, D. (2006). Tourism and post-disciplinary inquiry. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 9(4-5), 293-319.

Coles, T.E., Hall, C.M., & Duval, D. (2016). Tourism and post-disciplinarity: back to the future? *Tourism Analysis*, in press.

Hall, C.M. (2005). Systems of surveillance and control: commentary on 'An analysis of institutional contributors to three major academic tourism journals: 1992-2001'. *Tourism Management*, 26, 653-656.

Hall, C.M. (2006). The impact of tourism knowledge: Google scholar, citations and the opening up of academic space. *EReview of Tourism Research*, 4(3), 119-36.

Hall, C.M. (2011). Publish and perish? Bibliometric analysis, journal ranking and the assessment of research quality in tourism. *Tourism Management*, 32, 16-27.

Hall, C.M. (2013a). Development(s) in the geographies of tourism: Knowledge(s), actions and cultures. In S. Anton & J. Wilson (Eds.), *Geographies of Tourism* (pp. 11-34). Bingley: Emerald.

Hall, C.M. (2013b). Framing tourism geography: Notes from the underground, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 43, 601-623

Hall, C.M., & Page, S. (2015). Following the impact factor: Utilitarianism or academic compliance? *Tourism Management*, 51, 309-312.

Harzing, A.W., & van der Wal, R. (2009). A Google Scholar h-index for journals: An alternative metric to measure journal impact in economics and business. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 60(1), 41-46.

Hicks, D. (1999). The difficulty of achieving full coverage of international social science literature and the bibliometric consequences. *Scientometrics*, 44(2), 193-215.

Hicks, D. (2004). The four literatures of social science. In H. Moed, W. Glänzel & U. Schmoch (Eds.), *Handbook of Quantitative Science and Technology Research* (pp. 473-496). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.

Hunt, C.A., Gao, J., & Xue, L. (2014). A visual analysis of trends in the titles and keywords of top-ranked tourism journals. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 17(10), 849-855..

Jacsó, P. (2012a). Google Scholar metrics for publications: The software and content features of a new open access bibliometric service. *Online Information Review*, 36(4), 604-619.

Jacsó, P. (2012b). Grim tales about the impact factor and the h-index in the Web of Science and the Journal Citation Reports databases: reflections on Vanclay's criticism. *Scientometrics*, 92(2), 325-354.

Jacsó, P. (2012c). Using Google Scholar for journal impact factors and the h-index in

nationwide publishing assessments in academia-siren songs and air-raid sirens. *Online Information Review*, 36(3), 462-478.

Khabsa, M., & Giles, C.L. (2014). The number of scholarly documents on the public there may be a return here but web would usually follow on web. *Plos One*, 9(5), e93949.

Kousha, K., Thelwall, M., & Rezaie, S. (2011). Assessing the citation impact of books: The role of Google Books, Google Scholar, and Scopus. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 62(11), 2147–2164.

Law, R., & van der Veen, R. (2008). The popularity of prestigious hospitality journals: a Google Scholar approach. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 20, 113-125.

Law, R., Ye, Q., Chen, W., & Leung, R. (2009). An analysis of the most influential articles published in tourism journals from 2000 to 2007: A Google Scholar approach. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 26, 735-746.

Lee, H.A., Law, R., & Ladkin, A. (2014). What makes an article citable? *Current Issues in Tourism*, 17, 455-462.

Leydesdorff, L. (2008). Caveats for the use of citation indicators in research and journal evaluations. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 59(2), 278-287.

Leydesdorff, L., & Felt, U. (2012). Edited volumes, monographs and book chapters in the Book Citation Index. *Journal of Scientometric Research*, 1(1), 28-34.

Leydesdorff, L., Moya-Anegón, F., & Nooy, W. (2015). Aggregated journal–journal citation relations in Scopus and Web of Science matched and compared in terms of networks, maps, and interactive overlays. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, DOI: 10.1002/asi.23372.

McKercher, B. (2008). A citation analysis of tourism scholars. *Tourism Management*, 29, 1226-1232.

McKercher, B. (2014). A changing of the guard in tourism research leadership. *Trinet*. Available: <http://www.robivetrioni.it/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/changing-the-guard-2.pdf>.

Mingers, J. (2009). Measuring the research contribution of management academics using the Hirsch-index. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 60(9), 1143-1153.

Moussa, S., & Touzani, M. (2010). Ranking marketing journals using the Google Scholar-based hg-index. *Journal of Informetrics*, 4(1), 107-117.

Munar, A.M., Biran, A., Budeanu, A., Caton, K., Chambers, D., Dredge, D., Gyimothy, S., Jamal, T., Larson, M., Lindström, K.N. Nygaard, L., & Ram, Y. (2015), *The Gender Gap in the Tourism Academy: Statistics and Indicators of Gender Equality*. Copenhagen: While Waiting for the Dawn. Available: <http://www.tourismeducationfutures.org/about-tefi/gender-equity-in-the-tourism-ac>

Murphy, J., & Law, R. (2008). Google scholar visibility and tourism journals. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35, 1078-1082.

Oppewal, H. (2015). Citations as a currency: Every performance measure creates its own behaviour: Commentary on the Soutar, Wilkinson, & Young article. *Australasian Marketing Journal (AMJ)*, 23(2), 162–164.

Orduña-Malea, E., Ayllón, J.M., Martín-Martín, A., & Delgado López-Cózar, E. (2014). *About the size of Google Scholar: playing the numbers*. Granada: EC3 Working Papers, 18: 5 September 2014. Retrieved from arXiv:1407.6239v2.

Osborne, J. W., & Holland, A. (2009). What is authorship, and what should it be? A survey of prominent guidelines for determining authorship in scientific publications. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 14(15), 1-19.

Özbilgin, M. F. (2009). From journal rankings to making sense of the world. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 8(1), 113-121.

- Pendlebury, D. A. (2009). The use and misuse of journal metrics and other citation indicators. *Archivum immunologiae et therapiae experimentalis*, 57(1), 1-11.
- Rosenstreich, D., & Wooliscroft, B. (2009). Measuring the impact of accounting journals using Google Scholar and the g-index. *The British Accounting Review*, 41(4), 227-239.
- Serenko, A., & Dumay, J. (2015). Citation classics published in knowledge management journals. Part II: Studying research trends and discovering the Google Scholar effect. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 19(6), 1335-1355.
- Soutar, G. N., & Murphy, J. (2009). Journal quality: a Google Scholar analysis. *Australasian Marketing Journal (AMJ)*, 17(3), 150-153.
- Soutar, G. N., Wilkinson, I., & Young, L. (2015). Research performance of marketing academics and departments: An international comparison. *Australasian Marketing Journal (AMJ)*, 23(2), 155-161.
- Torres-Salinas, D., Robinson-García, N., Cabezas-Clavijo, Á., & Jiménez-Contreras, E. (2014). Analyzing the citation characteristics of books: edited books, book series and publisher types in the book citation index. *Scientometrics*, 98(3), 2113-2127.
- Wardle, C., & Buckley, R. (2014). Tourism citations in other disciplines. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 46, 166-168.
- Zopiatis, A., Theocharous, A. L., & Constanti, P. (2015). 'The past is prologue to the future': an introspective view of hospitality and tourism research. *Scientometrics*, 102(2), 1731-1753.

About the Author

C. Michael Hall is a Professor at the University of Canterbury, New Zealand; Docent, Department of Geography, University of Oulu, Finland; Visiting Professor, Linneaus University, Kalmar, Sweden and Senior Research Fellow, School of Tourism and Hospitality, University of Johannesburg, South Africa. He has published widely on tourism, environmental history and food. Current research includes the World Heritage experience in Denmark, Germany, Mauritius, and Sweden and the Nordic wilderness.